

# City of Annapolis

Department of Planning & Zoning  
145 Gorman Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Annapolis, MD 21401-2535

[PlanZone@annapolis.gov](mailto:PlanZone@annapolis.gov) • 410-260-2200 • Fax 410-263-9158 • TDD use MD Relay or 711 • [www.annapolis.gov](http://www.annapolis.gov)

## Historic Preservation Commission VIRTUAL PUBLIC HEARING May 11, 2021

The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) of the City of Annapolis held its regularly scheduled public hearing as a virtual meeting on May 11, 2021. **Chair** Leahy called the meeting to order at 7:03pm.

**Commissioners Present:** **Chair** Leahy, **Vice Chair** Collins, Dr. Scott, Williams, Finch

**Staff Present:** R. Laynor- Chief, Historic Preservation, J. Tower, Assistant Chief, Historic Preservation, B. Cahalan, Jacquelyn Rouse, Joel Braithwaite-Assistant City Attorney

**Others Present:** Sheryl Wood-Counsel to the Board

**Chair** Leahy introduced the commissioners and staff. He stated the Commission's purpose pursuant to the authority of the land use articles but because there were no public hearing items, he waived administering the oath en masse to all persons intending to testify at the hearing.

### C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

**Chair** Leahy announced that Ms. Laynor is planning to retire and that the City Council issued her a citation. The Mayor and Alderwoman Tierney spoke kind words of Ms. Laynor. The HPC would like to add that Ms. Laynor was a tireless teacher, listening all the time to customers and helping residents to be aware of how the space they inhabit encompasses cultural history and the importance of preserving it because it is importance to current and future generations. Dr. Scott thanked Ms. Laynor for her guidance, professionalism, talent and great experience. He noted that she is fair and consistent always looking out for the best interest of the City. Mr. Williams added that it has been a learning experience and a pleasure to work with Ms. Laynor. Ms. Finch thanked Ms. Laynor the expertise that she brought to the HPC and that "you will be missed." **Vice Chair** Collins thanked Ms. Laynor for her guidance, knowledge, and great source of information. She wished her well.

### D. NEW VIOLATIONS AND STATUS OF ACTIVE VIOLATIONS

Ms. Laynor reported that the Department is working to resolve or abate a violation on Randall Street that involves work of replacing a stoop without any approvals from HPC or Inspections and Permits. This should be resolved in the next 60 days.

### F. CONSENT DOCKET

*Old Business*

- 1. 110 Compromise Street** – Marshall Harris/Hammond Wilson Architects – Revision to the existing Certificate of Approval #HPC2016-027 for alterations to accommodate new tenant. **Approved as submitted.**

*New Business*

- 1. 35 City Gate Lane** – Jeffrey Wilson/Hammerhead Contracting – Construct rear deck. (HPC2021-055) – **Approved as conditioned in the staff report.**

**Vice Chair** Collins moved to approve the applications for 110 Compromise Street and 35 City Gate

Lane as conditioned on the Consent Docket. Dr. Scott seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a vote of 5-0.

**G. OLD BUSINESS**

The HPC addressed the application for 110 Compromise Street on the Consent Docket.

**H. NEW BUSINESS**

**2. Maryland Avenue** – Anthony Clarke – Public Art installation – Umbrella Sky. (HPC2021-062)

Mr. Clarke using a PowerPoint presentation described the Annapolis Umbrella project proposed for Maryland Avenue. He explained that the project originated in Portugal and there are 45 similar projects around the world. He went over the installation process, the tools needed to install these umbrellas as well as the umbrella material. He showed the different views of the umbrellas from various streets in downtown and the signatures of support. There will be an umbrella insurance policy to cover liability for the City, Maryland Federation of Arts and the building owners. He has contracted with a licensed contractor to fix any damage that occurs during installation and take down. He went over the list of property owners who have granted approval to use their buildings. The proposal calls for hanging the umbrellas June, July and August. The applicant will assume the responsibility of maintenance.

Mr. Cahalan thanked the HPC for hearing the pre application and the full application. He added that it has been a pleasure working with the Applicant. He also thanked Ms. Laynor for her guidance during the process of this project as well as other projects and wished her well in her retirement.

**Staff:** Ms. Laynor restated her conditional recommendations as noted in the staff memorandum dated May 4, 2021. Mr. Tower added that a lot of work has gone into this project and it is a worthwhile project. He is hoping that the Applicant can obtain the other approvals.

**Public:** Two members of the public submitted comments included in the exhibits below. Since there were no other public comments submitted during the public comment period, **Chair** Leahy declared the public testimony closed at 7:39pm.

**Commissioners:** **Chair** Leahy noted that the application is not complete as other agency approvals are required.

The following Commissioners made a site visit on this application.

Name
Leahy, Collins, Scott, Finch, Williams

**Chair** Leahy accepted the following exhibits into the record.

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Types
C.1	HPC Public Hearing Application for Certificate of Approval dated 3/18/21 with attachments
C.2	HPC Certificate of Approval Revision Submittal Form dated 5/4/21
C.3	Staff Report and Recommendation dated 5/4/21 - Preliminary
C.4	Annapolis Umbrella Project Final Version Presentation

**Chair** Gallagher accepted the following exhibits into the record.

Exhibit Number	Names	Address	Exhibit Type
T.1	Alderwoman Tierney	Ward 1	Email dated 5/10/21
T.2	Karen Theimer-Brown	Historic Annapolis	Email dated 5/11/21

## I. PRE APPLICATION

**Chair** Leahy reminded those present that this pre application discussion is an informal discussion held as a courtesy to the applicants to determine feasibility as well as to address any other issues of concern that may arise at the hearing. This review does not constitute an approval and nothing discussed in this session will be binding on the commissioners or applicants. The applicants acknowledged that this is a pre application discussion and nothing discussed would be binding on the applicants or the HPC. The Applicants all acknowledged the statement.

- 1. 60 College Avenue/St. John's College** – Mellon Hall & Francis Scott Key Auditorium – The proposed project includes the rehabilitation of exterior elements as well as some minor adaptive features to address long-term maintenance and programmatic adjustments. Rehabilitation efforts and adaptive features primarily focused on the roof, auditorium stage house, and auditorium lobby.

The applicant acknowledged that this is a pre application and nothing discussed is binding on the HPC or applicant.

Mr. Reineking noted that HPC had questions regarding existing conditions in the rear loading dock so discussed the proposed changes for the loading dock. There is documentation that the corrugated sliding doors and the roof were altered. He went over the north and west elevation history. On the north side, the lobby will remain but will double as a gathering space for students and staff. He discussed the proposed treatment for the Francis Scott Key Lobby. He discussed the condition of the glass curtain wall and the need to replace it as well as the original entry doors. He discussed their desire to replace the doors on the east side with glass to address the water penetration issues and to be consistent with the architect's interpretation of the aesthetics of the building. The proposal also include adding new doors to the 1988 gallery addition.

Mr. Hall discussed the solar panels noting that the Mellon Hall rooftop is the best place for the solar panels. He added that since the last presentation and based on the feedback, the applicant decided to go with the flat panel. The applicant redesigned the array to accommodate the rooftop equipment and to have proper clearance around the panels as well as minimize the impacts to the views. He went over the views of the panels on the roof from various points on the site.

Mr. Tower believes the proposed treatment for the loading dock door is acceptable per guidelines.

Ms. Laynor commented that the design of the doors should match the 1988 addition and should keep the language of that addition since it is a noncontributing addition. She mentioned that the HPC and Staff should look at the whole of the lobby parts as they relate to SOI #6 to ensure that the project does not violate this guideline in particular.

**Chair** Leahy **summarized** that the application for 60 College Avenue, Mellon Hall pre application has several components. The minor component of the loading dock proposal is feasible as presented. It picks up some of the vocabulary of the existing newer additions and does not have an adverse impact on the historic structure. As it relates to the solar panels, the revised proposal with flat panels are moved back from the view shed and is rectangular and regular in nature so appears to fit in with the existing roof. The HPC made the request that samples be provided to show exact color and reflectivity of these panels to make sure it is the least obtrusive so that component is feasible. Regarding the whole of the lobby, there are multiple components including the east doors, the north entry doors, curtain wall and a new door accessing the exterior plaza or landscape feature. There were multiple options discussed regarding east doors to include the re-creation of existing doors or flat glass panel etched where the existing doors were. The HPC was split on what was the most feasible but the indication was that the etched panel might provide an issue regarding safety. In terms of the curtain wall, there was considerable discussion whether it should be restoration of single pane versus double pane glass for installation and the direction is for a sample of both. The HPC members can individually visit the site to determine which is most feasible. The brand new door from the lobby out to the new

landscape feature, there was considerable discussion regarding the presentation of the two options presented. Neither seem feasible and a new design was going to be created that references the vocabulary of the newer building that would be more appropriate. In general, the feasibility of the overall project is feasible but more fine-tuning is necessary on each of these features.

**J. OTHER BUSINESS**

**Chair** Leahy announced that there is a new Commissioner, Leslie Xavier, whose application is supposed to be forwarded to the Economic Matters Committee and then to the Council for review. He also noted that there was another applicant submitted to Ms. Raftovich for the approval process.

**K. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**

There was none.

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

With there being no further business, **Vice Chair** Collins moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:45pm. Mr. Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a vote of 5-0.

**The next meeting is May 27, 2021 as a virtual meeting.**

Tami Hook, Recorder